(46)

1902 G.R.S.

G. R. S. 58]

Previous references.

~~27.22 9/1899-900.~~

" ~~15.8 9/1902-3~~

Police 46 9/1902-3. ~~Revenue~~ (police.)

Later references.

~~1900/2~~

~~1902-3~~

File No. ~~1-7~~ 4 86

Serial Nos. 1—4.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 — 4

Major **Part B for** January 190

SUBJECT.

Dispute between the brahmins & Lingayats of Holahunnoor re-the setting up of a Kama idol by the latter.

R. 2693 & 18.3.02 From Brahmins of Holahonoor. Request that Lingayats should not be allowed to erect a Kama idol as custom.

2293 & 8.3.03 From Venkannachar and other brahmins of Holahunnoor. States that the Lingayats are trying to go against mamool for the past being countenanced by the head of the District and requests early orders on petition to forbid Kama being set up by the Lingayats.

9/18/98 & 14.5.03. From Dy Commr Shimoga forwards the above petition for a report with records

3T 1 & 19.5.03. [illegible]
70

Late, [illegible]

report has been made in his office no 745/68
dated 9.3.1901

4 2 028 & 25.1.05. To Venkannachar & other brahmins. States that the contention of the brahmins is unreasonable.

Indexed
[illegible]

Countermarked
[illegible]

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE,

(REVENUE AND GENERAL DEPARTMENTS).

(Full Office Note.)

Subject. Kama procession at Hole Honnur —

~~Letter~~ Petition No 2293 — J. 2174 dated 8th March 1903 from Venkamachar & other Brahmins of Hole Honnur, complaining that the Lingayets are trying to go against Manuel taken the matter of the —

Note.

The Petitioners state that it has been customary for the Brahmans only to set up an image of Kama in Kodi and for the Lingayets to set up another in a separate place in the Kumbar Street, that the Lingayets are trying to encroach upon the rights of the Brahmins and that they were at last allowed to go to ~~[illegible]~~ by the recent orders of the Dy. Comr, who had, thereby set aside his own and many other previous [illegible]

* 1. Statement of case in narrative form in regular sequence of subject matter or date.
2. Opinions to be stated only as supported by precedents, or general rules which should always be quoted.
3. Serial numbers in file, &c., to be always stated.
4. Dates of important documents referred should be given.
5. Write on both sides, leaving the same side as margin.

‡ 1. No. and date of latest letter or paper.
2. Catch words to show nature of subject.
3. Subject to be in red and body of note in black ink

enforcing the Manual observance. They pray that ~~the~~ order may be passed ~~to~~ ~~[illegible]~~ to the effect that the Manual privilege may be recognized and enforced. They pray for early order as the image of Kama setup 3 years ago is still remaining unburnt on account of the restrictions imposed on the Manual procession.

A draft forwarding the petition to the Dt Magte, Shimoga for disposal is submitted for appl ~~and~~ as also an endorsement to the effect to the Petitioners.

7/4/03

Submitted
Is the petition not to be taken as an appeal against the Dy Commr's orders?
I think it is better to call for a report from the Dy Commr on the matter.

7/4/03

The petitioners refer to a previous petition dated March 1900. Let me see this please.

7/4/03

This is said to be not traceable (Vide ~~slip~~ note by the P. Br.)

7/4/03

This has not been seen by the Asstt Secretary & the reads asked for by him not but up. What I want to know is whether a more determinative endorsement cannot be given. The Karnafuli val has passed by

14/4/3

* Since Asstt put up.

submitted -

On the previous petition dated 12th March 1900, the Dewan has recorded the following order "xx - The District Magistrate's action is quite sound. I think the matter may be allowed to drop, the last report of the Dy. Commr being recorded." (Sd.) P.N.K. 4-VI-01

The Dy. Commr's report was accordingly recorded but no reply was given to the Petitioners.

Endorsement may now be granted to the effect

Hogg

W. A.

that Govt decline to interfere with the orders passed by the Dyleesur Draft put up.

Subd for orders

Submitted

11/4/03 13/4/03 14.4.03.

18/4/3

The Dewan through the 2nd Counsellor

20.4.03

1218 15-4-03

The action complained of seems to be opposed to Council. May we not call for a report from the Resident by post? If however the Dewan thinks that we should not reopen the question, an endorsement of the kind proposed may be issued. I may observe that the Brahmin community of the place seem to have a grievance as regards the validity or otherwise of which some further investigation is not less desirable.

Recommending

20/4/03

9871 22.4.03

Submitted

21/4/03

Dewan

22.4.03

01568

Have no objection. We will go on further report when

6.V.03

Put up a draft

Draft

10/5/03

10/5/3

In reply to the enquiry made as directed above, the Dt Magte now submits the entire records of the case and invites attention to his letters noted in the margin (Flags A to D) and states that the matter has been finally disposed of by Govt Proc: No 1651S dated 12th June 1901.

Sl No: 5
(1) No 199/24 dt 21/8/03
(2) No 745 dt 9/3/01
Enc. 1608
Flag D (1.1.12)
1651S/1650

The detailed memo of 1st March 1900, by the Supdt of Police, gives the full history of the case, and the District Magte's order dated 7th March 1900 is to the effect that the Lingayats have no right to set up a Kama. ~~But~~ The Dt Magte however, observes "I am inclined to believe that the Lingayats are introducing an innovation in the matter, but granting that it is so I cannot consider it reasonable that they should be prevented from doing so. So long as they do not interfere with the right or comfort of their neighbours I do not see why these men should be debarred from introducing whatever innovations of worship or festive enjoyment the

Flag E.

Flag F.

they like. The Dt Magte declined to hold any enquiry and directed the Police to see that his order of 18th March 1899, allowing the Lingayets to keep the Kama image in a private house of theirs, with due safe-guards ~~being~~ to prevent any breach of the peace, was properly carried out. The Brahmins were at the same time told that it was open to them to get a decree or order of the Civil Court in the matter. As this last order was thought to be opposed to the ~~previous~~ direction laid down in para 8(d) of Govt order No 109 / Dtd dated 27th February 1893, the Dt Magte's attention was called to it, and in reply, he reported that the order above referred to was passed by him according to his best lights and that he was unable to get the matter compromised. Thereupon the Dewan passed the following order:— (Letter filed) Flag A

"Read the last sentence of cl.(d) of para 8 of the order of 1893. The Dt Magte's action is quite sound & I think the matter

matter may be allowed to drop, the last report of the Dy. Comr being recorded."

This was accordingly done; ~~but as already stated no reply was given to the~~

The other records submitted by the Dt Magte, relate to other disputes of previous years from 1890 to 1897-98. All the records and particularly the order of the Dt Magte dt 7th May 1898, clearly show that the Lingayets have no right to setup images of Kama in the tete.

x in Record No 5.

Submitted for orders

27/5/03

27/5/03

This note requires to be supplemented by a precis of the previous papers, including those to be sent from the Dt Magte. A brief abstract in narrative form is what is required; and this I hope Mr Venkaiya Rao Pleader will kindly prepare at an early date.

28/5/03

Submitted with the precis required. The delay in submission is due to Sundays. Pass ...

leave and holiday arrangements

A word of explanation seems necessary — a precis of only the very important papers is made lest it should unnecessarily and inconveniently be rendered long ~~and tedious~~

4/6/03

This precis is short and to the purpose, & contains all the information likely to be required —

4/6/03

I have a settled opinion on the merits of this case, which is already on record. It is submitted for orders.

8/6/3

Dewan
Chairman & the 2nd Councillor

I have given the question my anxious consideration. I would suggest that a brief order as below be passed:-

" Para 8 (d) of Govt. order No. 109 dated 27th. Feb. 1893 applies to this and similar cases where "in a town two rival factions endeavour to thwart and annoy each other." Admittedly, the action of the Lingayats is an innovation. Abstract principles apart, sentimental considerations cannot

A (Initialed)

ltogether be ignored in such matters. As observed n the order quoted above, "it is a wholesome rule to aintain things in statu quo and to require the party hich wishes to deviate from mamul to establish its right, if any, in a court of Justice." If an amicable settlement is not possible, the principle enunciated above should be applied and the case disposed of accordingly."

T. Gellewaiengal

Bangalore,)
14.6.1903.)

10835
15.6.03

02591

For nearly 30 years since the policy of repression did not remove the desire to assert the ordinary right of engaging a feast in a particular manner. This innovation has been effected from 1899 without creating a breach of peace. The interference of Magistracy is justifiable only on the ground of such apprehension. Is it necessary to interfere in this case? and when two parties are sitting down in a desirable manner, the door of freedom be shut up altogether & permanently even after the necessity for so doing has ceased. If the

The Collector is not in a hurry. I proved that the matter of the present Dy. Comr comes here and he may as well bring up the subject — the privilege which the Arab claim is not a positive one which they have to enjoy — it is a negative one, of freedom from another community under a permanent disability. not founded upon any royal license of exclusiveness or any exclusive custom. If however the Collector has been satisfied that the object of the suggestion is "to thwart and annoy the Arab" the case assumes a different aspect — and there is not in his suggestion upon which to lead to any such inference

26.VI.03

To the Collector

Dear — I am certainly not in a hurry, I am quite agreeable to your orders in the matter — leave it as proposed by the Dewan. Let the Pattani Chiefs see me and the Dewan about this when he comes here or at Alyskone which I think will be the next Darbar. Let me have a demi official intimation of the let the site be resubmitted to me in time.

F.295
30.6.03

29/6

30.6.03

30/6/03

Precis of the more im-
portant papers in con-
nexion with the Hole
Honnur Kama festival
case

The disputes between
the Brahmins and
the Lingayats of Hole-
Honnur in the Shi-
moga Taluk seem
to date as far back
as 1855. The records
now submitted by
the Dy. Commr
go back only to 189
although the me-
mo by the Supdt-

(Vernacular Correspondence)

of Police Hagy
gives a somewhat
full history of the
case.

In 1891, the Lin-
gayats of Hole Honnur
set up an image
of Kama in their
private land at the
Pete ~~up~~ against which
the Brahmins of the
place petitioned
to the Dy. Commr
for the removal
of the said Kama,
as against the
Manual.

But the Dy Commr
passed an order
on the 14th March 91
to the effect that
it was not desirable
to interfere and
get the image re-
moved simply be-
cause the Brah-
mins wished it.
The above order
was cancelled
by order No 832
dated 18/3/1892
as the Lingayats
had misused the
concession given
them.

Despite this the Peti
Lingayats brought
the Kama ~~festival~~ set
up by them and
placed it opposite
that of the Brah-
mins. On the pe-
tition of the Brah-
mins against this
act of the Lingayats
the Amildar of the
Shimoga Taluk
directed in his order
dated 26th March 1892
that the Kama
set up by the Linga-
yats should be
at once removed

Where do you get this?

3. Three years afte
wards i.e in 1895
the Lingayats set
up an image of Ha
ma in a private
house opposing a
public street alle
to be in contraven
tion to local usag
The Dist. Magste
in his order on
misc. case No 30
dated 11/3/95 stat
...? the facts and
circumstances o
the case rendering
quite apparent
that the said

K

Sivacharmen had
set up the image
not with the in-
tention of adoring
it, but with the
intention of convincing
their contumacious-
ness and wounding
the religious feelings
of the Brahmin
community. ..."
Under Section 144
of the Crim. Proc.
Code he directed
that (the eight)
the
said persons should
remove the Kamma's

image from the place in which it was kept within three hours from the time of notice upon them — which order was duly carried out

4. Again in 1897 the Brahmins petitioned to the 1st class Magste on the 12th March that the Lingayats had arranged to set up a rival god on which the Magste passed the Profs containing

the following order.

"I direct that under Section 144 of the Code of Crim. Proc. the Lingayats of Holeson-nur do abstain from setting up or keeping in any open place the image of Rama or any other image until they establish the right to do so in a competent civil Court and that if the image has already been set up, they do remove it within two hours of the service of this notice on them

In June of the
a
once year, the
complaint was
preferred by the
Brahmins of the
place to the Dist-
Magste that in
disobedience of the
order passed by
the 1st class Magste
the Lingayats did
set up such lings
and thereby commit
an offence punishable
under section 188 of
the Indian Penal Code
But in this instance,

the Dist-Magistrate—
jected the complaint
observing that —
"the Brahmins them-
selves omitted to take
their procession on
the sentimental ground
that their God should
not pass through a street
wherein the Lingayats
had set up their God
—— Thus there was
not any real obstruction
or even an objection by
word of mouth, but com-

Was it not
the Asst C = Magte
for it

obstruction. I doubt
if obstruction of this
sort is intended in
the said section If
the Brahmins did
not wish to take
their god through the
streets where the Sui-
gayats had kept
their god, the latter
cannot I believe be
held to blame there
for, nor forced to for-
go their right at
common law, of
setting up their gods
in their places and

worshipping them on account of a sentiment of the Brahmins. If the Brahmins have such sentiment they have no business to go out of their street into the streets of others. Nor can the act complained of be said to be likely to have occasioned a breach of the peace, inasmuch as admittedly none objected to the Brahmin procession and in the first place it was not likely to be started at all owing to

the sentiment al-
luded to. — . ."

6 In March 1898
on the petition of
the Brahmins, the
Dist. Magste issued
an order under Sec-
tion 144 (Crim. Proc
Code) that the Lin-
gayats should abstain
from setting up or keep-
ing an image of Kama
or carrying any such
image in procession
except according to
and to the extent al-
lowed by manul

But the Lingayats disobeyed this order and set up pieces with the result that the latter were pulled down by the Police by force, whereupon on the 22nd March 1898 the Lingayats petitioned ~~prayed~~ to ~~that~~ the Dist. Magste to rescind the order ~~passed~~ after holding a proper inquiry.

The Dist. Magste however rejected the complaint on the ground that the order was a temporary

one, that there was nothing for him to cancel, withdraw or confirm, and that a prolonged investigation without proper jurisdiction would not be beneficial to anybody.

7. At the same time next year (1899) the Lingayats petitioned to the Dist. Magste that they may be allowed to set up an image in a private house and after the Brahmin

procession was over.

They may be allowed to take up their own through their own streets ~~the~~ They were prepared to give security to the effect that they will not do anything calculated to provoke a breach of the peace or interfere with the Brahmins during their Kauna procession and cause any obstruction to them.

The District Magistrate referred this petition to the Sub-Ad of Police

for personal inves-
tigation and report,
and ordered on 18/3/9
... with due safeguard
to prevent any breach
of the peace, I think
there can be no objec-
tion to allow this being
done. A bond should
be taken to the effect
that they will not
offer any insult or
obstruction to the
Brahmins on the
occasion. A sum of
500 Rs may be taken
as the joint penalty

rom the petitioners

At the same time, the

Brahmins also prefered

a petition to the Dist.

Magste praying that they

may be aided in carrying

on their procession peacefully

as per manual as was done

in the previous years

This petition was likewise

referred to the Supdt of Police

for full investigation and

report.

Accordingly the Supdt of Police

made a thorough investigation

in the matter and submitted

a memo on 1/3/00.

The Supdt of Police
was in favour of
permitting the Pele
Lingayats ~~and~~ setting
up a Rama image
but under restrictions
imposed on them as
during last year and when
the Brahmin procession
passed the Lingayat
Rama image, the
latter should be closed
on all sides so as to
prevent it from
being visible to per-
sons passing on the
road

the Meanwhile, the
Brahmins sent up
two petitions to the
Dist. Magste praying
each of them to
prohibit the Lingayats
from exposing their
Rama image contary
to manual, to the latter
of which petitions the
Dist. Magste passed
the following order
on 7/3/00.
"... so long as
they (Lingayats) do
not interfere with

the right and comfort
of their neighbours,
I do not see why
these men should
be debarred from
introducing whatever
innovations of
worship or festive
enjoyment they
like. It is open to
the Brahmins to
get a decree or order
of a competent civil
court if they can.
The Police

that the Lingayats
do not infringe
any of the conditions
imposed by the orders
issued by me last
year in the matter
(18/3/99)

G

10. Once more on the 13th
March 1900 the Brahmins
addressed a petition to
the Dewan of Mysore
against the orders of
the Dist. Magste dated
18/8/99 and 7/3/00 and
prayed that the Linga-
yats be ordered to ab-

stain from any
innovation con-
trary to manual
and that the or-
ders mentioned
above be suspended
of effect and pre-
vious orders restored.
This petition was
forwarded to the
Dist. Magste of
Shimoga with
an official me-
morandum dated
22/8/00 calling for
an early submission

of an early report thereon
The Brahmins again sent
a reminder on the 3rd
August —
The Dist Magstes
report of 21/8/00 gave
a short account of
the dispute and the
actions he took in
the matter from time
to time.
11. The attention of the
Dist. Magste was drawn
to para 8(d) of the Govt.
Proc. No 109/D.H.O of 27/2/93
as his orders were thought

to be opposed to it;
and a further re-
port was called for
on 12/12/00.

12. The Dy. Commr's
reply was to the
effect that the
question could
not be solved in
a more satisfactory
manner after tak-
ing into due consi-
deration the posi-
tions and sentiments
of the opposing parties
in opinion,

there was no use of any further investigation on the subject; as the Brahmins opposed even the least concessions to the sentiments of their opponents, the case was not likely to be settled by any sort of compromise

13. On this, on 4/6/01 the Dewan ordered, that the Dist Magste's order was quite sound and that his report may be recorded which was accordingly done; but no endorsement to the petitioners was given (they Dewan having stated that the Spring Chap Stationer might not be allowed to drop)

14 Finally in March 1903 the Brahmins have again petitioned against the Lingayats being allowed to set up the Kama ~~tap~~ image in the Pete.

~~As~~ The 2nd Cr's remarks are as follows —

"The action complained of seems to be opposed to manual. May we not call for a report from the present Dy Commr."

On this a further report was called for and the present Dy Commr has sent in the records of the case of which ~~the above~~ this is a precis and he states that the matter has been finally disposed of in Govt Proc no 16555 of 12/6/01.
J 1650

D

Submitted

24/6/03

4.6.03

GOVERNMENT HOUSE

Re-submit to the Dewan for perusal of the 2nd & 3rd Remarks.

2/7/03

11/7
-03

11228
3.7.03

02725

Yes. Write DCG

4.VII.03

6/7/3

Draft D.O. Submd

7/7/03

Reference 804 17/3/03

Serial No. 10432

SECTION Police

FILE No. 47 A 190 3

No. 2 2 3

PAR. No.

OFFICE 23 MAR 1902

Name of Petitioner Veulcanmachi and other Brahm

Village } Holehonnur

Taluk }

District Shimoga

Date of Arzi 8-3-03.

Date of Receipt 12-3-03

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil

ABSTRACT

complaining that no orders have been as yet issued on their appeal dated 13-3-00, against the Shimoga Dy Commr's order dated 18-3-99 and 7th March 1900 in the matter of the image of Kama at Holehonnur, and stating that the Lingayets have been trying to get a manual for the festival being countenanced by the heads of the

MGCPB—5,000—10-11-02

4-3-03

17-3-03

1899-1900

19-3-03

Please enquire in judl Div as the Records of that Div for 1898 have not been received in the Gl Records

20/3/03

20/3

References put up

-3-03

Petn No 158A of 12-03

Serial No 2

THE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REGD 2293R
DATE 12-3-03

Postd 12-3-03

To:-

His excellency the Dewan of Mysore
in Bangalore.

The humble memorandum of Petition in continuation of the Petition of appeal dated 13th March 1900, against the order of the Deputy Commissioner and District Magistrate of Shimoga dated 18th March 1899 and of 7th March 1900 in the matter of the image of Kama at Holehonnur of the Shimoga Taluka, between the Brahmins and Lingayats.

1 This appeal referred to above was admitted but no further inquiry was instituted respecting the cancellation of the orders restrictive of the manual of Holehonnur where it has been customary for the Brahmins only to set up an image of Kama in Holi & the Lingayats to set up another in a stated place in the Kumbar street about the Pella of the place.

2 The Lingayats for the past many years are trying again grounds against manual of the place required be observed in the matter and they were at last allowed maintenance by the recent orders of the Head of the District, infringing his own and many other previous orders enjoining and enforcing the manual observance, which ought to be complained against.

3. The petitioners trusted that they would get speedy justice at the hands of your excellency but to their misfortune they were not heard; the matter for disposal having had to pass through the hands of the officer whose orders were the subject matter of the appeal. Even they could not get back office deposited for reply Telegram sent urgently from

image on date the 14th of March 1900.

4 For the past three years, the Brahmins for want of an
order from your Excellency affirming their privilege,
have been bitter in utter sorrow, unable to observe the festival
as image set up before three years has not been burnt
make room for a new image, on account of restriction
the humble proper procession and they think that
presence of an unbornt karma is ominous for the
village.

5 Your Excellency's humble Petitioners respectfully
renew their prayers to your Excellency to favour them
with a just and impartial recognition of the manial privilege,
existence of which is emphasised in the body of the many
various orders dating as far back as the British ad-
ministration of the State, after going personally through
the records of the case. They beg to trust that their
case would in the immediate future receive ~~your~~
~~respectful share of your Excellency's just & kind notice.~~

8th March 1903.

Brahmin Community
of Holehonnur
His Highness the Maharaja's
most humble & obedient subjects

6.

~~Police~~ File No 158 A-J02/03

Serial no 2.

47 of 1902-3.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

No J 1819 Sel-1

J.7.22 of 99-900.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 2293 dated 8th March 03 received at the Dewan's Office from Venkamachar and other Brahmins of Hole Honnur complaining against the Dt Magte's order in the matter of the Rama procession of the Lingayets at Hole Honnur is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosures,~~ to the ~~Inspector General of Police~~ Deputy Commr Shimoga Dt, for a report with records.

Dewan's Order

By order,

14/5/03

12/5/03

BANGALORE,

The 14/5/1903.

for Secretary.

14/5

OFFICE OF THE
No. 12479
20 MAY 1903
DEWAN OF MYSORE

J 2475

190 2/03.

SECTION Pol. FROM K. J. Subbanna Chetty Esqr.
Dist. Divisional Sheristadar
Shimoga

FILE No. 4791 Dist.

SERIAL No. 3 TO H. Kanjundayya Esqr. B.A. L.
Sub Ex. & the Govt. of Mysore
Ex. and Rev. Depts.

19

Dated 13th May 1903.

Despatched

Received

General No. 952

No. 706

Enclosure No. 1 bundle.

Adverting to his official Memorandum No. J. 1812 J. F. 22 & 99-00 dated 16th instant invites attention to the marginally noted reports in the matter of the Kama possession of the Linga yet at Holehonnur.

Not sent as yet

Jd

Refer to

Reps. rec. from Mysore on 15/5/03

9

File No. 15-SA of 1902-03
Serial No. 4.

No. 952 Enclosure
706 Separately

District Magistrate's Court,
Shimoga,
17th May 1903.

From
K. P. Puttanna Chetty, Esquire,
District Magistrate,
Shimoga.

To H. V. Nanjundayya, Esquire, M.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
General and Rev. Depts.

Sir,

Adverting to your Official Memorandum No. J. 1819 / J.F. 22 of 99-00 dated 16th instant, forwarding for report, the petition of Venkamachar and other Brahmins of Holehonnur complaining against the order of this Court in the matter of the Kanna procession of the Lingayats at Holehonnur I have

your kind attention to my marginally noted reports in the matter and to state that the matter has been finally disposed of in Government Proceedings No. $\frac{16515}{J.1650}$, dated 12th June 1901.

Dated 21st August 1900.
Dated 9th March 1901.

2. The entire vernacular records connected with the case are herewith submitted together with the petition received with the Official Memorandum under reply.

3. The enclosures of a petition presented by the petitioners, which were returned with your docket No. $\frac{17442}{J.1722}$ dated 26th June 1901 were delivered to one Gundachar of Holehonnur on 25th July 1901 and the receipt taken from him has been filed in the

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

W. Nettacrimpkett
District Magistrate,
Shimoga.

3 Drms 10

No. 2028. Serial No 5.

J.7.1584/02-03.

SECTION Police
~~MYSORE GOVT. GEN.~~ & REV. SECRETARIAT,

Dated, Bangalore, 25th June 1905

FILE No. ~~67 of 1902-3~~

S. No. 67.

ENDORSEMENT GRANTED TO Venkamachar and other Brahmins of Holehonnur, Shimoga Dt.

in reply to their Petition Registered No. J 2194 dated the 8th March 1903, appealing against the order of the District Magistrate of Shimoga permitting the Lingayats of that place to set up an image of Rama in a private house contrary to Manual.

Petitioners are informed that after a careful consideration of the facts of the case and the rights of the Brahmins & Lingayats to set up an image of Rama, Government have come to a decision that the contention of the Brahmins is unreasonable and cannot be ~~got~~ accepted.

Their appeal is accordingly rejected.

By Order,

23.1.1905

Secretary.

Copied 24/11/05

Examined. 16/1/05